

Recently, the non-partisan publication "Congressional Quarterly" reported that the Pentagon is receiving earmarked appropriations it has not asked for. Most of these earmarks are destined for pet projects within certain congressional districts, undoubtedly slated to meet political ends.

In fact... Recently, the non-partisan publication "Congressional Quarterly" reported that the Pentagon is receiving earmarked appropriations it has not asked for.

Most of these earmarks are destined for pet projects within certain congressional districts, undoubtedly slated to meet political ends.

In fact, 67 of the House Democrats who voted in favor to cut defense spending by over 20% are the very ones who have added \$485 million worth of earmarked defense appropriations for various companies located within their home districts.

Blatant contradiction? Many of these Democrats have already defined the defense budget as "bloated" and "overextended", but apparently the same characterization does not apply for such projects.

These earmarks put unneeded pressure on the Pentagon's desired budget. In order to keep the overall total amount appropriated from rising, Congress cuts funding for programs that the Pentagon actually wants!

I don't know about you, but I think the military is more qualified to make the call on what programs stay and what go.